

1776

S

THI

1776

176
87
PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

SIR JOHN THOMPSON'S
TORONTO ADDRESS.

THE POLICY OF THE ADMINISTRATION
ON TRADE,
THE TARIFF, RECIPROCITY
AND
PROVINCIAL RIGHTS.

MR. FOSTER'S VIEWS
ON
THE GROWTH OF OUR TRADE, THE SOUNDNESS OF OUR FINANCE
AND
THE DESTINY OF OUR COUNTRY.

1893

776

THE
which
the
tion
the
seco
Tra
the
for
furt
view
to P
pub
fam
supp
but
judg
cons
by
by I
The
cons
tion
whi

S
entl
bee

M
MEX
kind
tenc
You
for
larg
We
mal
we
men
mal
I ag
the
on
pre
like

SPEECHES OF SIR JOHN THOMPSON

AND

HON. MR. FOSTER.

The following addresses, the first of which was delivered at the request of the Young Men's Conservative Association of Toronto in the Auditorium, on the 13th of January, 1893, and the second at the request of the Board of Trade of that city at their banquet, on the 5th of January, 1893, are republished for public distribution, and for the further information of the people. The views of those who are responsible alike to Parliament and the people for their public utterances can never be made too familiar to those who must ultimately support or condemn them. And it is but fair that public men should be judged by their own utterances carefully considered by the electors, rather than by what they are alleged to have said by hasty, inaccurate, or inimical reports. These addresses contain the carefully considered policy of the new Administration, and the carefully compiled facts by which that policy is supported.

Sir John Thompson met with a most enthusiastic reception. When order had been restored he said :

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN - I am most grateful to you for the kind reception which you have just extended to me, and I am grateful to the Young Men's Conservative Association for this great opportunity to address a large number of the people of Toronto. We heard, sir, that you had a great many young men in the association, and we have brought a number of our young men from Ottawa to greet you and to make your acquaintance this evening. I agree with what the president said to the public, as well as to his association, on the occasion of his inauguration as president, that it is upon associations like this that the future of the party and

the future of the country must greatly depend. I was amused to see in one of the opposition papers shortly afterwards the statement that it was high time that I appointed a minister to look after this association. Ladies and gentlemen, I recognize the importance of the association as not at all overvalued by that remark. An association comprising nearly 5,000 of the young men of Toronto are worthy of a minister of their own; and until they get a better one I want to be understood as being a candidate for the place. (Applause.)

PULSE OF PUBLIC OPINION.

I need not tell you, but I have often told the people of my own province with pride, that the people of Toronto, awake, alive and active as they are on the public questions of the day, give the pulse beats of public opinion throughout this great country whenever electoral struggles come on; and, sir, I cannot help stating at this early part of my address a proposition which has lately been made, and which it is my privilege to give voice to to-night, that the associations of Toronto, including this great association, should build for themselves a permanent home in this city in which all could be combined, and all could be accommodated. There could be no greater, no more fitting tribute to the memory of the great statesman who for nearly half a century was at the head of this great party than that it should take the name and place of the Macdonald Memorial in the city of Toronto. (Prolonged applause.) I hope that the idea that is thus put forward with a view of giving, not accommodation merely, but a home for these organizations, will be carried forward with success, and that Toronto will have

the pride of having in that way a very substantial monument to our departed chieftain. I think there is good reason for this. There is good reason for the associations of Toronto to have a home. You have lately been addressed by the eloquent leader of the opposition, and the people of Hamilton have heard him in glowing terms describe the hope—the still lingering, flickering hope of the Liberal party of this country. (Hear, hear.) He has traced an historical parallel, namely, that once the Whigs in England were fifty years out of office.

IN THE WILDERNESS.

The recollection of the fifty years' sojourn in the wilderness of the Whigs under Charles James Fox and other great Whig statesmen gives heart and hope to the Liberals of Canada to-day. But you must remember two things, one of which he must have thought of himself, that was that while the Whigs were for fifty years out of office Conservative statesmen were laying broad and deep the foundations of the greatest empire that the sun ever shone upon. (Applause.) He forgot, too, this fact, which this association will do well to bear in mind, that we have been but fifteen out of fifty years in office, and so, if we are to stay for thirty-five more, the Conservative associations of this city had better set about to look for a permanent home at once. (Hear, hear.)

NO NEW STORY.

Mr. President, our coming before you as a new administration has been heralded in such a way that I am afraid I shall have to disappoint you this evening. It has been heralded in such a way as to indicate that I have a new story to tell you. Ladies and gentlemen, the party to which I belong obtained power and obtained office and public trust nearly fifteen years ago; but I am proud to tell you to-night that we have no new story to tell you, and that we stand by the principles on which we obtained office then, and on which we have held it with the approval of the people of Canada ever since. (Applause.) Let me call your attention to what the great ambition of the Liberal Conservative party was in 1867, under the guidance of Sir John Macdonald, and what it has been ever since. The guiding ambition of that party has been to establish a great Canada. (Hear, hear.) Its policy was called the national policy. The name

has been travestied in a hundred ways. The name has been treated as applicable only to the rigid lines of a custom tariff; but in the mind of the statesman who conceived it, and the statesmen who have followed it up, it meant far more than a tariff arrangement for Canada. (Hear, hear.) It meant the purchase of a great northwestern territory, which should be the home of the young farmers and the people of Canada. It meant that instead of going to the fertile fields of the western States, in the United States of America, they should have a great fertile northwest of their own under the British flag, and where they can enjoy Canadian institutions. It meant that the development of the country should go forward by the extension of lines of railway, which should not only connect every town and every village in the country from end to end, but which should build up the desolate lands in the northwest, pierce the Rocky mountains and unite the province of British Columbia with the sister provinces by the Atlantic coast. That policy has been carried forward. It has been carried forward in a way that has made Canada an object of pride to every person who admires British institutions. We have expended treasure, effort and struggle upon the accomplishment of that policy. We have expended, it is said, too much treasure upon it, but I think there are few who believe that nowadays. When I remind you that over and above all the increase of public debt we have spent in railways and canal improvement alone upwards of \$13,000,000—forwarding and completing the scheme to make Canada a great nationality, I have to tell you to-night, as the unworthy successor of that great statesman whom I have named, and of the statesman who followed him, and who has been compelled to retire from your service only by the heavy hand of affliction, that we stand by the policy of making Canada a nation. We will succeed, if the earnest and patriotic efforts of young Canadians can do it. (Applause.)

THE CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY.

We have been addressed upon this subject very lately, let me remind you again; we have been told that the country is not prosperous. We have, during the last two or three weeks—during the last week in fact—had facts placed before the people of this country

ways.
licable
tariff;
ho con-
to have
than a
(Hear,
a great
ould be
and the
instead
the west-
ates of
a great
der the
n enjoy
nt that
should
lines of
connect
in the
which
s in the
ountains
Colum-
by the
s been
carried
Canada
y per-
stitu-
reasure,
mplish-
pended,
n it, but
ve that
hat over
blic debt
d canal
\$13,000,-
ng the
nation-
ght, as
t great
and of
im, and
re from
hand of
policy of
will suc-
efforts of
plause.)

TRY.

on this
ind you
e coun-
, during
ring the
placed
country

from the public records, and from the mouths of responsible men, showing the vast progress which the country has achieved; showing that her railway system is the finest in the world. If we take the statistics of business of the banks, the accumulated savings of the people, their investments in life insurance, or in other modes of investment, the statistics showing the bulk of our trade and commerce, we shall see that there are no 5,000,000 of people in the world more busy and more prosperous, more active and more alive to the wants of their country than the 5,000,000 of Canadians are today. (Applause.) I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to mark the important fact that while these statements have gone before the people of Toronto and the people of Ontario widely, they have met with a singular response by our friends of the opposite side. We have been told that it is trash to talk of the prosperity of the people, when nearly a million of people have fled from that prosperity. (Cheers.) But, ladies and gentlemen, have they, down to this moment, controverted one fact or one figure of the long array of statistics which have proved the statements made by our friends as regards the activity and success of this country, and the growth of its trade and commerce, and its development in every channel? Have they attempted to wrestle with one of those figures or to deny their conclusions? It is very easy to talk about trash, to talk about the exodus—but the plain figures are there, and cannot be wrestled with. No, sir; to call it trash and to call it buncombe is easier and makes prettier sentences for an after-dinner speech than would the discussion of the plain facts. Let me call your attention to another fact in connection with this criticism. We are told that while we are taking figures as regards the progress of the country we are very conveniently leaving out of sight certain other figures which are of great consequence, that have great bearing on this question.

THE CENSUS.

Now, I am proposing to-night to talk to my fellow-Canadians in the plainest way about what our opponents call the disagreeable figures of the census. We have had an exodus ever since the British provinces were founded. The exodus has been going on at a rate which both political parties have de-

plored. The difference between the two parties is that fifteen years ago Liberal statesmen were asked to deal with that question and to endeavor to check the exodus, and they denied the right and power of statesmen to deal with that question by legislation or by government effort at all. The difference is that Sir John Macdonald and the statesmen who battled with that question said that by giving the home market to our own people for their labor, and by encouraging the establishment of industries throughout Canada, it was possible at least to check that exodus, and to give employment to a large number of those who were seeking employment in the United States. We could not stop it; no man supposed that the exodus could be completely stopped. The exodus proceeds very largely from the enterprise and adventure of the Canadian people; but there were two or three things that were done to check it, and make the exodus, as a matter of necessity, no longer exist in Canada. One was this—that the fertile lands of the Northwest were to be opened up for the young farmers of Ontario. Another was that, by keeping the home market for our farmers and operatives the industries of our country were to be greatly enhanced. Both of these have been done. I admit the exodus still. There are various kinds of exodus, ladies and gentlemen. There is the Cartwright exodus—(laughter)—which reaches the tall figures of a million and a half, and its author soared above that, even, and claimed that a good many more were lost from the Canadian population, until somebody turned round his own calculation, applied it to the United States, and showed him that according to his mode of calculating, the exodus there had been an exodus from the United States of six millions and a half. (Laughter.) There is the kind of exodus which the leader of the opposition described a few evenings ago as an exodus so great that we were unable to keep the beggarly five millions of people in this country that we have in it. Why, ladies and gentlemen, unfortunately, while the population has grown in the last decade over eleven per cent., and has reached nearly five millions of people, it has never quite reached that mark yet, and to talk about being unable to keep in this country the beggarly number that we have, is to talk what that great orator

described a few seconds afterwards as "mere trash and buncombe." What is the exodus? The facts have been ascertained within the last few weeks from the United States records; and they show that the whole population of the United States Canadian-born, is about 930,000. How many of those have we lost in the last decade, and how many in the decade before? The number of Canadian born people in the States has increased during the last ten years 265,000 people. Greatly to be regretted; but, ladies and gentlemen, the loss in the decade before was far greater, although not in numbers, in percentage—(hear, hear)—and, while in the decade before that we had increased that number by 50 per cent., during the last decade the increase has been pulled down to a little over 36 per cent. But the assurance with which our opponents declare that the national policy is to be blamed for our having an exodus at all, is something appalling to the intellect of Canadians. (Hear, hear.) What is it in the national policy that has created an exodus? Is it that the number of our working people is less than it used to be before the national policy was established?

ALLEGED EFFECTS OF THE N. P.

We are challenged to look at the disagreeable figures of the census; but let us take those figures all together, and we find that the pay-roll of persons employed in industries in this country has increased in the last ten years by 112,000 operatives. (Applause.) Has the national policy expelled operatives from this country? The figures of the census, which we are challenged to look into, show that the operatives increased by 112,000. Is it that capital has been flying from the country—flying from its resources—under the national policy? Those same disagreeable figures which we are challenged to look into show that the capital invested in the industries of Canada has increased by \$190,000,000 during the last ten years. (Applause.) Is it that the national policy has made it harder for the workmen to make wages in this country? Would to God that wages and employment were more abundant than they are! But let us face the facts and figures which we are asked to face, and we find that in wages \$41,000,000 more were paid at the end of the decennial period than were paid at the

beginning of the decennial period. (Applause.) Is it that the product of those manufactories and those industries has not added to the public wealth and the public welfare? We find that \$160,000,000 has been the output added directly to the product of these manufactories during that period as compared with the ten years before. We are told that if our opponents could but get into power, as a contrast to what I have shown you as the results of the national policy, the prosperity of this country would be so apparent that it would not need to be proved at all. Well, sir, the Liberals were in power, and the prosperity was not proved at all, and was not visible even by the aid of a microscope. (Applause and laughter.) I have given you the results. I have spoken to you about the great advantage which has been secured by the opening of the fertile lands in the Northwest. As regards the class of young men who were accustomed to leave the province of Ontario, to a great extent that has supplied the new fields which these young men sought for in the United States. As regards the people of the province of Quebec, who have been emigrating largely to the United States, and the people of the maritime provinces, remember—side by side with what I have told you we have done for the people of Ontario to check the exodus—remember, that we have given for wages, that we are giving for wages now, two millions of dollars a year more for the employment of labor in the cotton industries and the leather-working industries, which have hitherto drawn the principal part of the population who have emigrated from Quebec and the maritime provinces to the United States. (Applause.) That has been one of the results—one of the achievements—of the national policy; and when my friend the leader of the opposition told in pathetic terms the other night the story of the brave-hearted man who, going to the polls, wished to wave the old flag and cheer for it—when he told the story of what his wife said to him about the misery of having their sons working in the State of Michigan instead of having employment under the old flag, that was precisely the state of affairs before Sir John Macdonald developed the national policy. (Hear, hear, and applause.) But now that patriot will be able to wave the old flag and feel that his sons can continue to

live
them
North
their
I am
mon
the
what
those
were
in co
the C
is to
and I
that
descri
ment
resour
togeth
a pol
plaus
the g
us in
have
—if
now
born
will
woul
oper
the f
pay-
(Hea
have
woul
inste
Man
still
and
hom
go in
Let
in t
deve
grea
nati
need
only
in n
acti
beca
circ
whi
othe
we
tion
has
end
eati
and
first

live under it and establish homes for themselves in Manitoba and the great Northwest territories instead of spending their labor in the State of Michigan. I am preaching, I know, an old sermon to you with regard to what the national policy has done, and what its aims and what the objects of those who have laid its foundations were; but it is for me to tell you to-night in connection with the past history of the Conservative party, what our policy is to be for the future—(hear, hear)—and I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the national policy, as I have described it, not as a mere tariff arrangement, but as a means of developing the resources of Canada, knitting its people together and welding them into a nation, is a policy that we intend to pursue. (Applause.) Before the eloquence of even the great leader of the opposition charms us into abandoning that policy, he will have to tell what advantage it would be—if the exodus to the United States now reaches as a total of all Canadian-born persons in the country 980,000—he will have to tell us what advantage it would be to have it swollen by the operatives who would be turned out of the factories of Canada and added to the pay-roll of the United States factories. (Hear, hear, and applause.) He would have to show us what advantage it would be to have our young farmers, instead of living under the old flag in Manitoba and our own Northwest, still plodding on in the State of Michigan, and the mother breaking her heart at home to think that her children had to go into exile in order to earn their bread. Let me tell you, therefore, that we stand, in the first place, for such national development as will make this country a great country, a united country and a nationality of itself. (Hear, hear.) The need is greater than ever. That is not only because our people are increasing in numbers and increasing every year in activity, but the need is increasing because of the pressure of surrounding circumstances and the adverse policy which presses closely upon us from the other side of the border. Why is it that we have heard so much about annexation? Why is it that the Liberal party has been compelled in spite of itself to endeavor to tear out the cancer which is eating away its existence? (Hear, hear, and applause.) Why is it that for the first time they come upon platforms

and stand up before dinner tables and talk about the great Canadian people, the great Canadian future and the great Canadian nationality? It is because that cancer has eaten almost to their very heart, and that the time has come when the people of Canada, deeply in earnest about this question, are going to have no trifling with it whatever. We say then that the very corner-stone of the policy on which we take our stand—which we will build our future upon—is British connection. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) A little while ago, whenever we said even that much we were taunted with waving the old flag. And a lot of traitors, and a lot of cowards who have not the courage to be traitors, a little while ago would sneer at the old flag, sneer at the loyalty which we inherited from our fathers, and sneer at the institutions which our fathers were so proud to leave us. (Applause.) But, thank heaven, a change has come over the spirit of their dream and they cannot too often talk loyalty now—(hear, hear, and laughter)—cannot too often talk about British connection; cannot too often stand at dinner tables and talk about the great Canadian people, using phrases and words which we sounded from the platform in the last campaign, and for which we were scouted and sneered at whenever any one of them could get upon a stump. (Applause.) Well, ladies and gentlemen, there is a secret about all that—hardly a secret, because it lies open to him who will search and investigate. The growth of that annexation sentiment is not confined to our country. You will find it developing immensely in the United States—(applause)—where my particular friend, Sir Richard Cartwright, declared that it was necessary to educate public opinion. Why is it that that sentiment within the last five years has so greatly grown and developed there? Why is it that among the American people five years ago, but very few of them, cast any glances of desire upon this fair Dominion, but now the most powerful press have is devoted to the propagation of annexation views? A change has come over the condition of affairs in the United States. The condition of the agricultural interest had fallen in that country far worse than it had fallen in Canada. (Hear, hear.) The deserted farms, the encumbrances upon the arms,

the mortgages upon the farms, the chattel mortgages—everything which indicates a faltering and failing industry marks more deeply the agricultural interests of the United States than the agricultural interests of Canada—(hear, hear)—and one of their great journals the other day was frank enough to put it thus—and that expresses the whole situation there—“In the United States we have practically got under plough the last acre of land that it will pay to raise wheat upon in this country.” (Hear, hear, and applause.) What is our condition as compared with that? My friend, Mr. Daly, the minister of the interior, can point to you thousands of square miles of virgin land on which wheat of the finest description raised in the world can be raised at prices which will absolutely distance competition by the farmers of the United States. (Hear, hear and applause.) The most careful thinkers in the United States say that while the last acre of that description of land has been put under plough, the growth of population in that country has been such, is being such, that within ten years they will practically cease to be a wheat-exporting country, and very soon after that it will become a wheat importing country. Where is the great storehouse from which they will import their wheat? Where is the great storehouse from which the markets which they have been supplying are then to be supplied? Within your beloved country. (Cheers.) And this is the cause of that vast change which is passing over this continent, and why the Dominion of Canada possesses to the thinking people of the United States a hundred times the value which to them it possessed a single decade ago. It behooves us, therefore, Liberals as well as Conservatives, to take care that this question shall never be trifled with, and to see that any policy which seeks to build up Canada as a firm, strong, true nationality is supported by the votes and the sympathy of the men and women of Canada more strongly than it ever was. That is why, in coming before you, in response to your invitation to state what the policy of the new government is to be, I feel bound to tell you that we intend to stand by the policy which will make Canada a nationality of which every Canadian will be proud, and that we intend, above all things, that that nationality shall be based upon British prin-

ciples and British connection. (Cheers.) I am proud to see statesmen like those belonging to the opposition party realising at last, late though it is, that it is time to speak out true Canadianism. I welcome every word of that kind that they utter; but, ladies and gentlemen, I will ask them one little favor more, and that is, not to trifle with the question by adding their own contributions to the work of the celebrated Edward Farrer in developing the annexation literature of New York. I will ask them if they are true Canadians and if they spurn annexation, as I believe they do, with all their hearts, to spurn from the door that emissary who is giving the people of the United States all their grievances and all their theories about the desperate condition of Canada, for they are adding volume and strength to the movement in the United States. Bye-and-bye it will grow tenfold in force, and may press upon us in a way much more gloomy than we see at present. I will ask them one favor more, and it is not to trifle with the question of annexation by paltering about independence. (Hear, hear.) Let no one mistake my meaning in regard to the word independence. I sympathise with what has been said about what may be the distant future of this country. I suppose there is no nationality, no set of people, no race living in any country but has the worthy ambition that they shall be a great and independent people. Independent we are in its true sense when we have the greatest liberty of self-government that any country has in the world. (Hear, hear.) Independent we are in this sense, that we have the protection of so powerful a parent that no country in the world dare take from us—(cheers)—dare take from us the independence that we enjoy. Independent we may be in the future to a greater extent, but that time can only be in distant years, when the population and development of this country have reached many times what they are to-day. To say that independence is practicable or reasonable within the present generation is to talk absurdity, if not treason. Everybody knows that, with the great nation to the south of us, comprising sixty millions of people, immensely strong in war, immensely powerful even in peace, and immensely aggressive in the pursuit of their trade and commerce, and every interest that

belong
care a
safegu
(Appla
indepe
of nat
ally th
in effe
tion of
for if
people
Britis
the n
which
Great
States
But I
suppor
stand
enanc
that n
little
that
distor
which
to tr
States
I spo
exists
some,
leader
seems
Unite
trade
I dec
down
neigh
better
the U
and s
having
chang
made
did, t
perfe
were
I adm
I did
Unite
hardl
woul
not u
funde
and
chang
antic
tariff
While
not
moul
chang

(Cheers.) like those party realists, that it is imperialism. I am kind that and gentle little favor. I am with the contribution. Ed- the annexa- ck. I will Canadians tion, as I t hearts, t issary who ited States ir theories dition of olume and the United grow ten- upon us in an we see one favor with the paltering ear.) Let regard to sympathise about what this coun- ationality, ng in any hy ambi- great and ndent we have the ment that l. (Hear, e in this ion of so try in the ers)—dare that we be in the at time when the of this mes what pendence ithin the absurdity, ews that, uth of us, e people, mmensely eir trade rest that

belongs to them, it requires the vigilance, care and help of the empire in order to safeguard the rights of Canada to-day. (Applause.) The man who advocates independence while we are in that state of national existence advocates practically the absorption of Canada—indirectly in effect, if not by intention—the absorption of this country by the United States, for if the sentiment which animated the people of this country were destroyed by British connection being severed, and if the material help, and the prestige which is more than material help, of Great Britain were withdrawn the United States would have us at their disposal. But let me not be misunderstood, to be supposing that when I say we intend to stand by that national policy we are so enamored of every detail of that policy that nothing can be changed. I spoke a little while ago on that subject. I find that my words have been strangely distorted. I was speaking of the anxiety which existed in this country in regard to trade movements in the United States, and referring to that subject I spoke about the expectation which exists in this country on the part of some, and even on the part of the leader of the opposition himself, who seems to regard the movement in the United States as absolutely a free trade movement. Speaking of that I declared it was not for us to pull down our house because we saw our neighbor changing his—that we had better not make changes simply because the United States may make changes and speaking thus I was misconstrued as having said that we would not make any changes in our fiscal system until they made changes in theirs, admitting, as I did, that the national policy was not perfection. The Liberals of this city were told that what I said was that, while I admitted that the tariff was not perfect, I did not propose to improve it until the United States improved theirs. I need hardly tell you that such a statement would have been absurd, and that it was not uttered by me. I was speaking of fundamental changes at the moment, and I said that we should not make changes in our tariff arrangement in anticipation of fundamental changes in tariff arrangement in the United States. While I admit that the national policy is not perfection, and requires to be moulded from time to time to suit the changing circumstances of this country,

I did not propose to postpone all change until tariff reform has been completed in the United States. We propose to put our hands to the work in the session which is coming, and to go on as far as may be necessary, changing and moulding from time to time the tariff system perhaps the most energetic way of expressing the necessity for that was used by the leader of the opposition last night when he said such changes are necessary because "what is the use one day may be an abuse the next." The tariff, carefully and wisely framed as the tariff was, may require revising, in consequence of changed conditions of this and surrounding countries. We propose, in the words which were extended to me as a motto on the toast card at the Board of Trade banquet, simply to lop mouldering branches away.

You understand perfectly well, ladies and gentlemen, without my telling you, that while to-morrow the papers will say I am very vague and sphinx-like in speaking thus it is impossible for a minister, standing upon a public platform, in advance of a session of parliament, to put his finger upon one item or another item of the tariff and say that this shall be repealed, or that shall be cut away. All that we can state to you, under our duty to those to whom we owe the highest duty as members of the government, is to state that the principle upon which we intend to proceed is that of sustaining the national policy, and of reforming the tariff to suit the wants of the Canadian people, as they may change and alter from day to day.

GREAT TARIFF REFORMERS.

I may claim some little credit for the Conservative party in making this statement, when I remind you that in the changes we have made in the direction of tariff reform we have shown ourselves to be the greatest tariff reformers in the world. In the session before the last, while the new government was but a month or six weeks old, we struck from the tariff the duties on sugar, which threw off in the interest of tariff reform one-twelfth of our entire revenue, upwards of three millions a year, and I think the people, seeing the circumstances under which we did that three years ago, will have faith in us that having put our hands to the work we will carry on that work, and wherever we can improve the

conditions of trade, or reduce the public burdens, we shall do so in the early future. We have been taunted, in that connection, with "looking to Washington," with waiting on the United States. Well, what would you think of a minister of trade or commerce who would shut his eyes to the movements going on in other countries, and care nothing whether they made articles free or taxed them 60 or 80 per cent.; care nothing about that, but go on with an iron-bound tariff which he would claim as perfect? The best minister of finance or trade and commerce you can have is the one who keeps the keenest lookout for the changes of tariff and trade in other countries, because it is only in connection with changes of that kind that we can understand how our trade and our fiscal policy are to be directed and moulded from day to day. But let me ask you, in the few minutes that I shall still detain you—for my time is running rapidly out—let me ask you to consider for a few moments, my fellow-Canadians, what the policy is that we are asked to adopt instead of this. What proposal is it that the leaders of the opposition speak of so frequently and so eloquently as they do? What proposition is it they offer that will add to the growth of our manufacturing industries; that will increase wages; that will increase employment; that will bring new capital into the country? They propose a policy—namely, unrestricted reciprocity—which, I humbly think, would take more operatives out of Canada in one year than have gone in the last ten. (A applause.) But when you wish to test their sincerity in the policy they put before you, I can ask nothing better than that you should take their own words. Now, if you will read their speeches which have been delivered within the last six days, you will find that what Mr. Laurier has proposed as the trade policy of the Liberal party is this: They propose to have absolute free trade as it is in England—(A faint "Hear, hear," which evoked ironical applause.) Now, my friend, do hear the end of the sentence. They propose to give you at the same time a tariff of about 60 or 80 per cent. as against England and all the world, except the United States. Let my friend who said "hear, hear" answer me this question, or at any rate think of it himself: What is the kind of free trade they have in England? What

would the apostles of free trade who were cited only last night as the great exemplars for this country, Cobden and Bright, think of a proposition which would induce a colony to have free trade with a neighbouring country and the famous McKinleyism as against all the world? What would he think, or anyone else think, of calling that "free trade as it is in England?" What would he think of the statesman who stood on a Canadian platform and said while advocating a policy like that, that he founded his policy on true English Liberalism? All I can say is that a true English Liberal would not own a man in whose mouth such a policy as that was placed. The people of Toronto were told so lately as that also that the Liberals were able to get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States—(a cry of "Hear, hear.")—that it was very preposterous to see the woebegone looks of the Canadian emissaries who came back from the United States unable to get reciprocity. Why, my friends—(one of them said hear, hear to emphasize it)—so they could; so we could have got it last February. The statesmen of the United States were in favor of unrestricted Reciprocity. Why? Because unrestricted Reciprocity is a thoroughly American policy—as opposed to a British or Canadian policy.

THE WASHINGTON VISIT.

When Mr. Foster, Mr. Bowell and myself were in Washington last February we could, barring a settlement of the details, have concluded everything in a week, and I will tell you why we did not. In the first place, because there was required to be a common tariff as against the world, excepting the United States, and that tariff the tariff which then existed in the United States; and, in the next place, we were obliged to agree distinctly to discriminate against the mother country. On those terms we could have got unrestricted reciprocity. On those terms we shall never take it. (Prolonged applause.) And on those terms, I venture to say, the Canadian people will never let the Liberals take it. (Hear, hear.) Now, ladies and gentlemen, let me call your attention to this question. Why have I spoken of it as a thoroughly American policy? Well, anyone who saw and heard the late Secretary of the United States, that great man, James G. Blaine,

and th
Foster
questi
unders
that, i
up en
trade
countr
mercy
tariff
becaus
else.
go in
what
with c
entirel
the mo
becaus
tion of
Atlant
no tra
the U
the m
tariff i
hear.)
inexpe
betwe
althou
bargain
the fis
unrest
In or
Unite
fish in
on the
territo
plete
many
which
I do
obtain
Canada
will b
leader
to ma
going
land,
time,
that
runni

La
quest
addre
—(a
you,
simp
adhe
whic
is a

trade who as the great Cobden and the nation which free trade and the just all the ink, or any "free trade" that would he stood on a while advocating the Liberalism? the English man in whose was placed. ere told so liberals were reciprocity with of "Hear, preposterous of the Canadian from the reciprocity. them said (b)—so they got it last the United unrestricted unrestricted American British or

IT.

ell and my- t February ment of the ything in a yly we did ause there on tariff as the United ariff which states; and, ere obliged discriminate On those restricted s we shall applause.) are to say, ver let the ar.) Now, e call your Why have I American saw and the United G. Blaine,

and the present Secretary, Mr. John W. Foster, and heard them discuss that question, saw at a glance that they understood the whole question—saw that, if the trade of Canada were bound up entirely with the United States, a trade with the world excluded, this country would be absolutely at the mercy of the United States. The tariff would be made at Washington, because it could not be made anywhere else. Ladies and gentlemen, I won't go into the old argument showing what condition we should be in then with our British trade hampered if not entirely cut off; with our connection with the mother country practically severed, because we would have assumed a position of hostility to that country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, Canada would have no trade except that which she had with the United States, and that would be at the mercy of the men who make the tariff in congress at Washington. (Hear, hear.) They saw, likewise, that it was inexpedient to settle the fishery question between the United States and Canada, although we were willing to make a bargain upon the fairest of terms. No; the fishery question must be settled by unrestricted reciprocity, too. Why? In order that the fishermen of the United States might come in and take fish in the inshore waters of Canada, and on the seacoasts of Canada, within the territorial limit, and exhaust and deplete them, as they did their own coasts many years ago. These were terms on which we could have obtained a treaty. I do not deny that the Liberals can obtain it, but there are terms which the Canadian people do not want, and never will have. (Hear, hear.) And for the leader of any political party to attempt to make the people believe that he is going to have free trade as it is in England, and McKinleyism at the same time, is to attempt to persuade them that he can ride two horses which are running in opposite directions.

THE FUTURE POLICY.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are other questions upon which I would like to address you, but you have a great many—(a voice—"Go on")—others to address you, and I make way for them by the simple statement to you that, while we adhere to the principles and conditions which have made our party what it is and made Canada what it is,

we are glad to welcome the sentiments of adhesion to the principles of British nationality which have been uttered by statesmen on the other side of politics. I repeat to you that the future of this country, the welfare of this country, its existence, its union, depend upon the hearty co-operation of the Canadian people of both sides of politics in establishing firmly British institutions here; and those principles as regards the development of the country, those principles as regards the tariff of the country, which will develop the great resources Canada has and make her that which we, are all proud to reiterate on every occasion when we think of her name, the brightest possession that Great Britain has to-day, and a possession which, by ties of trade, by increased ties of affection, and by the ties of mutual interest, will not only continue a possession of Great Britain but one of the great pillars of the British empire. (Applause.)

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

The chairman, Mr. Armstrong, on rising to introduce the next speaker, being interrupted by cries of "The schools."

Sir John Thompson arose again, and said: "I heard the cry, and did not know what it meant until I asked my friends Mr. Wallace and Mr. Maclean, who told me that it was 'the schools,' and that I was expected to speak upon the Manitoba school question. Fellow-citizens, I have nothing to conceal from you on that question. It is a question which, as I said a few nights ago, has aroused the warmest feelings of the people of Canada on both sides. It is, let me tell you, however, a question for which there is but one solution so far as we are concerned, and that is to stand strictly by what the constitution provides. An appeal has been presented asking the governor-general and his government to interfere with the existing system of education in the province of Manitoba as it was established about two years ago. Our right to interfere, to say nothing of the policy of interference, is challenged by those who are upon the other side, and within the next ten days we are to hear that question discussed as to our power and as to our obligation under the constitution to deal with it. Let no man or woman in this hall or elsewhere suppose that lurking

in the breast of any minister of the government of Canada there lies a secret design to interfere with the legitimate rights and powers of provinces. (Loud applause.) We will not interfere with the rights and powers of any province, nor will we desert any duty which is imposed upon us by the constitution, no matter how painful it be to our feelings or how obnoxious to others it may be. I want simply to impress upon you this, that candidly and honestly we intend to be guided in that matter by the constitution, and by the constitution as it will be expounded by the highest authorities that can be got to expound it, and not by the private opinion of any member of the government. When I tell you, therefore, that we intend to be guided by the constitution, and to stand by the constitution on that subject, I am not equivocating and I am not concealing. The whole question will be argued by the counsel on both sides in the face of the whole

people of Canada, and you will be able to see in the next ten days the arguments that are presented on both sides, and you will be able to measure the value and weight which ought to attach to them, and eventually you will be satisfied, whatever impulses excite one class of people or another, that we have simply done our duty under the law whether it agrees with our own religious inclinations or is against them. (Loud applause.) You will not ask me to say more, for this reason, that I would be prejudicing a case which has not been heard, and which we have invited the parties to discuss before us all, the report of which will be presented to you within the next ten days, and, therefore, ladies and gentlemen, I have told you all that anyone can say consistently with his duty upon the question, and all we intend to say and all we intend to do with regard to it will be open to every Canadian man and woman who cares to study the subject and follow our course.

MR. FOSTER'S ADDRESS

(5th Jan.) *Long 3-1893*

AT THE BOARD OF TRADE BANQUET.

Mr. Foster was warmly cheered on rising. He began his speech by alluding to two events, separated from each other by nearly four years—the presence of Sir John Macdonald as the central figure at a banquet given by the Toronto board of trade four years ago, and the recent unveiling of a bust of the late much-beloved chief of the Conservative party in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral in London. On the occasion of the latter event Lord Rosebery uttered a few eloquent words, among which this remark stood as the encomium, upon Sir John Macdonald, that he had grasped early and kept through his life the Imperial idea, “that the Anglo-Saxon empire is the greatest secular agency for good now known to mankind, that that was the secret of his success, that he was determined to die under it, and had striven that Canada should live under it.” These words every true Canadian and every true Briton might well take as a watch-word in both public and private life. Mr. Foster proceeded:—“When I spoke here four years ago the few words I said had reference to the progress of Canada in the past and her prospects for

the future. To-night I stand before you able to say—and glad am I, as well as every Canadian, that I can say it—that the promise of four years ago of continued prosperity has been fulfilled, beyond the expectation of myself and beyond the expectation of most of you here. During those four years our trade in exports has increased by \$25,000,000, or 28 per cent.; our imports by \$12,000,000, or 11 per cent., and our total trade by \$37,000,000, or 18 per cent. In that time I think I may say without being contradicted that there has been an output increasing in every branch of industry and production in this country; that public works have been gradually and continually pressed forward, until to-day we stand within a small measurable distance of the time when the great works undertaken at the time of confederation and later, as the works par excellence in this country, shall have been finished, the capital accounts with regard to them largely closed, and the great benefits accruing in point of cheapening of transit and encouragement of trade to go on for all future and growing generations of this country. (Hear.

hear, and savings, accumu- lency h business reached not man crops of great w an orde report up to th the cur govern to issue go thro every b and sho surpris four ye member I appro toast of of this trembli to-nigh to the c tural an well; h which t in the c idea w can for these first, th more c you sai indispe the gr nation- spirit—the bo streng things the sou that n the we comme which every diffusio (Appla possess do not the w elemen daily b its inf later c in the those

and before you
I, as well as
say it—that
ago of con-
gen fulfilled,
of myself and
most of you
years our trade
\$25,000,000,
\$12,000,000,
total trade by
In that time
being contra-
an output
of industry
country; that
gradually and
until to-day
measurable
on the great
time of con-
the works par
, shall have
accounts with
used, and the
point of cheap-
agement of
and growing
try. (Hear.

prosperous—although later great peoples could arise without the possession of large manufacturing interests—to-day it is as true as any fact that can be stated that the three are necessary to continued and permanent greatness. If the agricultural basis is not in the country itself, as in England to-day, that country must be at the mercy, to a certain extent, of foreign producers, of the benefit of which it may be deprived at any moment, under certain circumstances. Ask yourselves what Great Britain, with her pre-eminent commerce, with her pre-eminent manufactures, would be if she had the agricultural basis that the Dominion of Canada has to-day. (Hear, hear.) She would then be independent of the wide world for her food sources and supplies, and I ask your attention to this simple fact in order to raise—if it needs to be raised, and I think it does, and I think it may well be raised in order to raise in the minds of every Canadian here or who may read my words, a general and proper and proud appreciation of his country in its rich enjoyment of the three great sources in this trinity of which I have spoken. (Applause.) Have we grasped the agricultural capabilities of this country? Have we fully grasped the agricultural progress the country has made in the last twenty years? Let me give you a few figures to substantiate it. Not many years ago how small was the agricultural area of this country? To-day how large and how vast it is! So large and so vast that the mind of no single man sitting around these boards is able fully, with the information he possesses, to comprehend it, to grasp it in its entirety. The progress in the past in agriculture has been large and gratifying. Let me take just some articles. The products of the field in 1868 were raised to feed the population we had, and to export to the amount of \$12,000,000; in 1892 the agricultural products were raised to feed 5,000,000 of people—a much larger number than in 1868—and to export at the same time to the amount of \$22,000,000, an increase of 90 per cent. in that time. (Applause.) In 1868 animals and their products were raised to feed the people of this country at that time, and to export beside to the amount of \$6,500,000; in 1892 the 5,000,000 were fed from these products, and exports to the amount of \$28,500,000 were sent from the country to feed out

side people, an increase of 350 per cent. in the period named. (Applause.) Taking some examples of wonderful progress, cheese in 1868 was raised for the consumption of this country and for export to the value of \$500,000 worth; in 1892 it was raised for the food of this country and to export to the amount of \$11,500,000, an increase of about 800 per cent. In 1868 apples were exported to the tune of one-twelfth of a million dollars worth, besides what were consumed here; last year they were exported to the amount of \$1,500,000, an increase of 1560 per cent. (Applause.) And so, sir, I might go through the list and show to you the wonderful expansion which has taken place in the agricultural products of this country, as shown in the larger quantities required for the consumption of the people, and in these very largely increased exports for the consumption of people beyond us.

That is what has happened, but this is but a feeble promise of what may happen. Five millions of people having that number of mouths to be filled are in this country. Take your own calculation as to how much of agricultural products will be needed. Not only are five millions to be fed, but from the hives of Europe and of England there is a call for bread from millions of artisans, and an almost inexhaustible market for our products which we are beginning to exploit by reason of enterprise, adaptation and business methods. Put alongside of that market the boundless agricultural resources of this country, and I am right in saying that it is hard for us to grasp what the future may hold in store for this country in the line of agricultural effort. The manufactures of this country have grown largely. Twenty years ago how many classes of articles were made in this country compared with what are made now? There have been immense strides in our manufacturing industries. Take in connection with the progress which is being made in manufacturing industry our wealth of minerals, our carrying facilities, the enterprise and business methods of an enterprising and business-like people, and I say that there is no boundary to the future of the manufacturing of this country except the boundary of the call for the products and the limit of our enterprise and capacity. Coming into the domain of commerce, the same good story of progress may be told.

We hear sometimes that the government ought to take the fetters off commerce. There is a way in which the people and the government have done it. Some of you may remember the story of the sleeping princess in the fairy tale, so beautiful as she lay wrapt in a slumber which nothing had up to that time disturbed. It was only when the voice of the princely noble sounded in her ears that she arose and walked in her resplendent beauty. So the Northwest, with all its boundless capabilities and resources lay sleeping and beautiful, it may be, but powerless to rise and walk, to produce and develop, until the government and people of this country by their contribution of millions of dollars opened up that country, and the first whistle of the railway cars along the steel rails in the Northwest waked up its dormant and wonderful possibilities, and took the fetters off half a continent—(hear, hear and cheering)—and from the Peace river communications were established which will in the course of a few months allow your cargoes to go 2,600 miles out from the middle of this continent until they strike the waters of the deep ocean. By every foot of draught you give your canals and every line of possible communication you make, you cheapen the cost of transportation equally; to what was before useless you give value and to that which before had value more value. Every dollar of contribution for the canals, deep waterways and railways which have made the transporting facilities of this country unequalled by any country of equal proportions and equal age, has taken the fetters off commerce and roused the dormant possibilities for trade and the development of this rich country. (Applause.) Will you allow me one more word—a word of sympathy with that which fell from my friend the Lieutenant-Governor of this province. That is, taking what we have in those three respects, proud as we may be of our progress, confident as we may be in our present standing and hopeful of the future, there is one thing which we need to take more to heart. I mention it here in sympathy with the remark which fell from my honorable friend. Is it or is it not too much the fact that when a man finds himself useless for everything else, he has an idea that he can come into town and set up in a mercantile business and improve his

circums
of to-da
men g
technic
farming
compon
not a
have no
knowle
For in a
is small
Nothing
my few
princely
by the
itself.
cation;
can lea
can n
trade;
learn
manufa
in this
great c
have r
technic
this p
agricul
stituti
that it
work,
ment i
of the
country
money
but ins
and a
drudge
to a ma
mecha
has ge
making
produc
(Appl

Let
most
audien
necess
tion in
proce
ledge
of thi
when
speak
his o
to-day
open
the w
kets a

the govern-
ers off com-
which the
ave done it,
the story of
airy tale, so
n a slumber
at time dis-
the voice of
in her ears
ed in her
Northwest,
ilities and
beautiful, it
e and walk,
until the
his country
illions of
ry, and the
rs along the
voked up its
ilities, and
continent—
nd from the
were estab-
se of a few
to go 2,600
le of this
e waters of
ry foot of
and every
cation you
f transport-
before use-
that which
ue. Every
the canals,
ays which
ilities of
ny country
al age, has
merce and
es for trade
this rich
you allow
sympathy
friend the
province.
e in those
may be of
may be in
eful of the
h: we need
ention it
e remark
ble friend.
fact that
useless for
a that he
t up in his
prove his

circumstances in the commercial contest of to-day? Is it or is it not a fact that men go into farming without any technical or scientific knowledge of farming, what soils are required or what components must be given? And is it not a fact that in manufacturing we have not nearly the technical skill and knowledge that we ought to have? For in all these things to-day the margin is small, and the competition is great. Nothing struck me with greater force in my few days in Great Britain than the princely contributions which are given by the trades guilds and the government itself. What for? For technical education; institutions where the farmer can learn his trade; where the mechanic can master the principles of his trade; where the manufacturer can learn the secret of the processes of manufacture; and to-day what we want in this country, to put alongside our great capabilities and the progress we have made, is a more diligent study of technique. In that the government of this province has done its share; its agricultural colleges and its dairy institutions and the different instructors that it is sending out are doing valuable work, as is also the Dominion government in raising the quality and the grade of the agricultural products of this country, thereby putting not only more money into the pockets of the farmers, but inspiring them with a better hope, and a certain compensation for the drudgery of work, which always comes to a man when he is doing more than mere mechanical labor; when he feels that he has got hold of nature's secret, and is making her work with him for the production of that which he desires. (Applause.)

THREE THINGS NEEDED.

Let me call the attention of this most enterprising and business-like audience to these three things—the necessity for schools of technique, education in the processes appertaining to the processes of manufacture, and knowledge of the methods of commerce—for of this latter, if there ever was a time when a young, unskilled, raw man, so to speak, would have a difficulty in holding his own in commerce without it, it is to-day, when a man has to keep his ears open to the tick of the telegraph from the wide world, has to watch the markets and sources of supply, to appreciate

and ascertain the need for articles and products, if he would stand eminent in the race for mercantile wealth and for mercantile prominence. Now, in conclusion, let me thank you, Mr. President, and you, ladies and gentlemen, for the kindly way in which you have received this toast. The toast was important; these interests are the great interests of our country. I have but one more word to say, that these are not mere material things, but while you are exploiting and developing the material wealth of the country you are expanding the mind and elevating the people and making our scale of living and our scale of thinking higher than it has been before. But there is one thing more which I plead for, not that I feel that it is a quality in which we are lacking, but rather that it is one of which we cannot have too much, the subtle essence of patriotism which is true to its country, true to its present and confident in its future as well. There are so many people to-day who, if they went down to the sands of Egypt and gazed on the pyramids, would feel a discontented, unrestful feeling unless they could slightly alter their pose; who never look on the rings of Saturn but they feel they would like to carve off a piece here or add another bit there; who either have so little to do, or do it so badly, that, with all the rich resources of this country calling on them to develop them and make the country great, they are wasting their time discussing impossibilities with reference to the status of this country. I have just this word to say, restrictionist though I have been called by my honorable friend here, I refuse utterly, and I believe in Canada's best interests, the restrictions which are at present implied in the overburdening weight and in the limitations which attach themselves to independence for Canada, with her wide territory, her thousands of miles of coast, her dominant, powerful neighbor and the demand for capital to be applied to the development of the riches which lie crying out to be brought forth, to be exploited in this country.

Let us have faith in our own country, and refuse to follow the charmer that has been spoken of, charm he never so wisely, into that nirvana of continentalism or annexation. (Applause.) I believe in something better, and my individual creed is this: I am a British subject, and I refuse to be separated

from the empire to which I belong. (Cheers.) As my heritage in that empire goes back a thousand years and more, I do not wish to lose the inspiration that comes from that fact. Her heritage of glory is mine, and if glory in great institutions and progress is worth anything to a country, I want to feel that as a British subject I keep it, and keep it permanently with me. Her future is my future, and I believe individually that our course to-day should be to assist with undiminished strength and enterprise, and with what collective wisdom we have, in the development of our country. The conditions which exist to-day, and time and the inevitable progress of nations,

and that Power above which makes for righteousness will, I believe, assuredly lead us into the way whereby we may be continuously good Canadians, but where we may feel also the throbbing pulse of an imperialism which encircles the world, which is bounded by no continents and which is enclosed by no seas, but which is as wide as the world, a guarantee of continual peace and a synonym for the highest religious, civil and political liberty. That is the expectation which I cherish; that is the expectation that I believe Canada looks for. In that there is enough to claim the highest thought and the noblest effort of every Canadian. (Loud cheers.)



makes for
, assuredly
by we may
dians, but
throbbing
h encircles
led by no
osed by no
the world,
eace and a
igious, civil
is the ex-
that is the
anada looks
h to claim
he noblest
oud cheers.)